

**BAR RAGSDALE-
BARBER**

**EVIDENCE FOR
NEW TRIAL**

Defense Strikes
Amendment,

Dorsey Promises
Sensation,

Frank Makes
Statement

Judge Ben H. Hill has signed an order allowing the defense of Leo M. Frank to strike from his extraordinary motion for a new trial the amendments referring to the affidavits of Rev. C. B.

Ragsdale and R. L. Barber that they heard Jim Conley confess to the Mary Phagan murder.

Mr. Ragsdale has made an affidavit for Solicitor General Hugh M. Dorsey, in which he repudiates the affidavit made to the defense of Frank and used in an amendment to the extraordinary motion.

The solicitor, however, declares that he will insist on "showing up the entire transaction."

Another development on Tuesday in the case was the issuance of a signed statement by Frank in which he again commented upon Chief Lanford's statement that the State does not charge perversion to him. Frank's statement is given in full below.

Judge Hill in allowing the motion to strike the Ragsdale-Barber amendment ordered that the original affidavits of the two men be made a part of the court record in the case. This action was presumably taken by the court in order that the affidavits may form the basis of perjury affidavits.

It is known that when the hearing of the extraordinary motion in the Frank case, which will be resumed on Friday, is completed, the grand jury will take up a thorough investigation of the whole case, probing all charges and counter charges of perjury and subornation of perjury.

WITNESSES UNDER FIRE.

The various witnesses who made affidavits, which they later repudiated, will come under fire, and all of the charges of subornation of perjury will be vigorously investigated, it is said.

It is understood that the fact that the defense had withdrawn the Ragsdale-Barber amendment will not prevent the Solicitor General's introducing the repudiating affidavit.

The solicitor, however, will not be quoted as to any method of procedure, but answers all questions relative to the matter by

saying simply: "We will insist most vigorously on showing up the whole transaction."

Mr. Ragsdale was not at his home in Kirkwood during the day. His son, who resides with him, did not know that his father had made an affidavit for the solicitor until seen by a *Journal* reporter. The young man also did not know that his father was likely to figure in the case until the original affidavit was published.

Relative to the Ragsdale-Barber matter, the attorneys for Frank have made the following statement:

"On Thursday, April 23, 1914, there appeared at the office of Z. Rosser, in the Grant Building, two men who professed to have important information in reference to the Frank trial. One of these represented himself to be a preacher and the other a former member of his flock."

MEN WERE UNKNOWN.

"These two men were unknown to each of us. Neither of us had ever seen or heard of them before."

"L. Z. Rosser acted in taking the affidavits of these men. He put them to the test of the most thorough cross-examination of which he was capable. There was no effort to lead them, to add to or color their story. On the contrary, they were given clearly to understand that Frank's counsel wanted only the truth, and in taking their affidavits we were seeking nothing beyond just what they knew and knew accurately."

"The affidavits were prepared in their presence, almost their very words being taken by a competent and honest stenographer. After the affidavits had been typewritten, they were carefully read to each of the witnesses and sworn to before a disinterested notary public."

Neither one of us dreamed that they were acting corruptly, but believed that they were acting from pure motives to correct the wrong of their former silence.

They were asked to give the names of their friends and associates, as the

(Continued on last page, column one.)

PDF PAGE 20, COLUMN 1

BAR RAGSDALE- BARBER

EVIDENCE FOR NEW TRIAL

(Continued from Page 1.)

law requires. They promptly gave some of the most correct and upright men in the city of Atlanta.

Some of these men were promptly seen in an effort to determine whether these men were what they seemed and represented themselves to be.

HAVE MANY VOUCHERS.

The result was in keeping with their claims. Some of the best men in Atlanta vouched for them and we felt justified in presenting their story to the court.

It has come to our ears this evening that both these men now recant and claim they framed up their story.

If these rumors be true, we denounce the perfidy of these men with all the vehemence of our natures.

In this Frank case, we have never wanted anything but the truth, have never made use of anything but what was believed to be the truth.

We have believed and now profoundly believe in Frank's innocence, but even that conviction has never induced us to say one word that the whole city of Atlanta could not hear, nor to do anything that the whole state of Georgia could not see.

If these rumors are true, we will at once cut these perjured witnesses out of this case, just as we have in the past, and just as we will in the future, every fact and circumstance that even squints at unfairness or perjury.

In proof that we did not act even credulously and inadvisedly in this matter, we send you herewith copies of affidavits of men who vouch for the character of these men.

L. Z. ROSSER,

HERBERT HAAS,

LEONARD HAAS.

REUBEN R. ARNOLD.

Frank Again Pleads For a “Square Deal”

The following statement was issued by Leo M. Frank
Tuesday:

To the People of Atlanta: The city of Atlanta has grown to its present greatness and must depend for its future growth upon young men like myself who, reared in other places, but hearing of

the greatness of Atlanta, come here to cast their fortunes with its people. When six years ago I left my former home in Brooklyn, where I was raised, to come to Atlanta to help build up a new enterprise that would increase its prosperity and give employment to many people, I accepted the opportunity gladly and came without any foreboding of evil. I supposed that so long as I lived a decent, upright life, and did my duty, that no harm could come to me anywhere. I did not suppose that there was a place in the United States where a man could not get fair play. Suddenly, like a bolt of lightning from a clear sky, this terrible calamity came upon me. I was at work on a Saturday afternoon in my office where I had a right to be, where it was my duty to be, when a young girl was foully murdered in the same building. As to how she was killed or who killed her, I knew no more than a man 10,000 miles away.

I was arrested and put on trial, or rather, what was called a trial. The minds of the people, already infuriated by the brutality of the crime, were driven to madness by the whispered word that I was a pervert and a degenerate of the foulest type. I became an object of detestation and loathing. The whole city, excepting a few faithful friends, turned away from me in disgust and abhorrence. People said, "Even if he is not guilty of the murder, he ought to be hung." Under such conditions, it was impossible for me to get a fair trial. As one of the lawyers expressed it, I had as much chance for my life as a canary bird in a basket of cats. No wonder that the judge of the court certified that he feared for my life and the lives of my attorneys should the jury acquit me. No wonder, one of the jury was moved to tell a friend that if they had freed me, not one of the jury would have left the court house alive.

And now, here at the last hour, comes up Mr. Newport A. Lanford, head of the detective department, after Mr. Burns has cornered him, and serenely announces that the charge of perversion never entered into the case, that neither the state nor the police department ever claimed or does now claim that I was

a pervert, and that the charge was injected into the case by my own lawyers. Evidently, he considers the people of Atlanta an aggregation of asses. But was there ever such effrontery? After using this charge in every way conceivable to railroad me through to the gallows, after the solicitor has made it the chief subject of his nine-hour speech, after the Supreme Court has affirmed the verdict principally on that ground, he now says it did not enter into the case. Not enter into the case! I say it was the whole case.

It is deeply significant that simultaneously with the withdrawal of the charge of perversion against me, Mr. Burns has come into absolute proof through letters written in Conley's own hand that he is a vile degenerate and practiser of unnatural crimes which the law of this state punishes by life imprisonment in its penitentiary. These letters are in his possession and are open to the inspection of any man in Atlanta who wants to look at them. Is it possible that my life of decency is to weigh nothing? Is it possible that this city has in it so little of the spirit of fair play?

Am I not stating the truth, when I say that the withdrawal by Chief Lanford of the charge against me of perversion puts my case in a new and entirely different light? Is it not a circumstance that should appeal most powerfully to the courts in my application for a new trial? Is there a man in Atlanta who would deny that the charge of perversion was the chief cause of my conviction, or deny that the case, without that charge, would be an entirely different question?

LEO M. FRANK